



Attorney Docket No.: ISOT-018

IN THE UNITED STATES
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Invention: Spray Cool System With A Dry)
Access Chamber)
Serial No.: 10/649,328)
Filed: 8/26/2003)
1ST Inventor: Knight, Paul A.)
Examiner: Pape, Zachary)
Group Art Unit: 2835)
Attorney: Michael S. Neustel)

APPLICANT'S RESPONSE TO
FIRST OFFICE ACTION DATED JUNE 13, 2005

Sir:

A. FEE CALCULATION

No Additional Fees Due.

B. STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW HELD ON AUGUST 3, 2005

The Applicant has reviewed the Interview Summary mailed on August 5, 2005 regarding the interview that occurred on August 3, 2005. The Applicant further supplements the Interview Summary with the following regarding the two conversations held on August 3, 2005:

First Conversation With Examiner Pape and Examiner Vortman

- The Applicant stated that Young only taught a single cover that required removal in order to access both compartments.
- The Applicant further stated that the Roberts reference merely teaches a swamp cooler design for cooling the interior of a house which is non-analogous to the present invention which involves the thermal management of electronic devices with spray cooling.

- The Applicant also stated that the Roberts reference does not teach a separate chambers sine the wet chamber is fluidly connected to the dry chamber of Roberts. The Applicant also stated that never of the chambers in Roberts were sealed.
- The Applicant further stated that the covers in both Young and Roberts are not “movably” or “pivotally” attached to the chassis since they are just removable with fasteners.
- Examiner Vortman suggested possibly amending the independent claims to include the dry chamber door being “pivotally” attached, but that a new search would possibly have to be performed if this feature is added.

Second Conversation with Examiner Pape

- After the first conversation, the Applicant called Examiner Pape to further discuss the Young reference.
- The Applicant stated that Young did not have a dry chamber since Young merely teaches a spray chamber (24) and a “coolant supply chamber (26)” which are both wet chambers.
- The Applicant stated that the coolant supply chamber (26) in Young is for storing coolant which is pumped via the pump (36) wherein the coolant is collected by the sumps (42, 44) in both of the chambers (24, 26).
- The Applicant specifically mentioned pages 6 and 7 of the Young reference which discuss the two wet chambers.

C. AMENDMENT OF APPLICATION

Responsive to the Official Action mailed June 13, 2005 and the Interview Summary mailed August 5, 2005, please amend the application as follows:

In The Drawings:

The Applicant has amended Figure 1 to properly identify the dry chamber with reference numeral 50. The Applicant has attached hereto a Replacement Sheet for Figure 1. The Application respectfully requests that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn in view of this amendment.